(3)

(2)

CT 100/1

S.B.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR (C.G.)

Writ Petition NO. 3438 /2003

PETITIONER : Hansram Shyam, S/o. Jhagar Singh Shyam, aged about 35 years, Occupation Police Constable No. 675, R/o. Barridih, P.O. Chapora, P.S. Ratanpur, Distt. Bilaspur (C.G.) (Posted at present City Kotwali Bilaspur (C.G.)

P. R. No. 3963/03
Presented by Shri Rakesh Soni
dated 16.10.03

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :1. The State of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary for Home Department, D.K.S. Bhawan Secretariat Raipur (C.G.)

2. Director General of Police Police Head Quarter Bhopal (M.P.)

3. Joint Director Agriculture Bilaspur Division Bilaspur (C.G.)

4. Director of General of Police Police Head Quarter Raipur (C.G.)

5. Superintendent of Police (Special Police Branch) S.P. Office Bilaspur (C.G.)

RECEIVED COPY
16/X/03
Clerk to A. G. Bilaspur

WRIT PETITION U/A 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

543

(22)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W P No.3438 सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	19/01/2004	

Shri Abhay Kumar Tiwari, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri Ranbir Singh, learned Govt. Advocate takes notice on behalf of the respondent no.1 to 5.

By this writ petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner seeks to challenge inaction on behalf of the respondents no. 1, 2, 4 and 5 by not sending the Police Verification Report about his antecedents to the Agricultural Department.

Brief facts leading to filing of this writ petition are that in the year 1997 petitioner appeared in the interview for the post of Agriculture Development Officer before respondent no.3 that too with the permission of respondent no.5 – Superintendent of Police, Bilaspur. The petitioner is working as Constable in the Police Department and the petitioner was selected for the said post and some forms were sent to the petitioner by respondent no.3 for returning the same after filling the same and thereafter the respondent no.3 informed the respondent no.5 and sought the Police Verification Report about his antecedent and in turn

(23)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित -2-	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

respondent no.5 sent it to the office of the respondent no.2. Since then the papers seeking police verification report of the petitioner are lying in the office of the respondent no.2.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has submitted several representations to the authorities for sending his police verification report to respondent no.3. His representation dated 17/06/2002 is Annexure P.4 which was submitted to respondent no.2 and he again submitted his representation dated 17/02/2003 to respondent no.5, but nothing has happened. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner may be allowed to make a detailed representation to respondent no.4 and respondent no.4 be directed to send his police verification report to respondent no.3 to which learned counsel for the respondent/State has no objection.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and having regard to the fact that it is surprising that why police verification report is not being sent to respondent no.3 and in the

(24)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित -3-	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

circumstances, the petitioner is allowed to make a detailed representation to respondent no.4 within ten days and in turn respondent no.4 will consider the representation of the petitioner and decide the same with a reasoned order for sending the police verification report of the petitioner to respondent no.3. If any assistance is required from the petitioner, respondent no.4 may ask the petitioner to furnish the information. But Police authorities are not entitled to withhold the police report - specially when the petitioner appeared in the test after permission of respondent no.5.

With the aforesaid observations and directions, this petition stands disposed of. Consequently, I.A.No./9925/2003 stands disposed of.

Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order.

Sd/-
L.C.BHADOO
Judge

[पीछे देखिये

19 A 21.1.04